3:Watson E-4,5 (1943) 1952 SM4 Guarani SM4

consuming them without the more strenuous labor of axe work. In most new clearings, a second burning was necessary, and in such cases, the unburned slash was nearly always piled up about fallen trunks or live trees.[a] Planting was done in the spring in the ash-covered, burnt-over ground in the midst of charred and partially consumed trunks and stumps. These impediments caused relatively little difficulty as far as Cayuá planting was concerned because the principal planting implements were a digging stick (*sarakwá*) and possibly some sort of pre-iron, hoe-like implement. Such tools worked well enough in the irregular, trunk-strewn ground, but the crude and untended appearance of the aboriginal *kokwá* (agricultural clearing) caused unfavorable comment both from the Jesuits and from Dr. Rengger, accustomed alike to the smooth, unobstructed European fields where the plow had to pass.

A point of some difficulty to affirm, for lack of actual information on the Cayuá, concerns the sexual division of labor in agriculture. That the men did the heavy work of cutting and burning the fields seems certain enough, and this is also the case today. But today men have a considerable role in the rest of agriculture as well, including the planting, tending, and harvesting of a number of crops. The women are also important at present, and, indeed, apparently indispensable in farming certain crops, notably corn. However, the work of agriculture after the burning of the fields is now by no means exclusive with women. But in early accounts of Coastal Tupi, agriculture, except for cutting and burning, was largely and unmistakably a female province; the man's time was much occupied in hunting and fishing. Besides the comparative data from Tupi-Guarani peoples, we have the fact that a post-Conquest change in the sexual division of labor in agriculture is likely in the Cayuá instance. We have some grounds, therefore, in spite of the lack of documents, in stating that the aboriginal Cayuá had female agriculture.

Somewhat less important to the aboriginal Cayuá than agriculture (but quite important notwithstanding) were hunting and gathering. Agriculture was a seasonal, primarily female, activity, which left the men free for extensive hunting and fishing. Among game animals that the Cayuá esteemed were deer, *paca*, *caitetu* (sometimes *taitetu*), *tapir* or *anta*, *capivara*, and armadilloes. The *paca* is a rodent, the *caitetu* is a wild pig that roams the forests in bands and is considered dangerous quarry because of the numbers in which they usually move, and the *anta* is an ungulate and American relative of the hippopotamus and horse. The armadillo or *tatú* is much smaller quarry and is usually dug out of his burrow. The meat is considered good by the Cayuá, and the shells have long been used for vessels and containers. Several wild varieties of the cat family are also found locally, but the Cayuá did not apparently share the

[a] This process is today known in Brazil as *coivara*, both the name and the practice having been taken over from the aborigines, according to some.

3:Watson E-4,5 (1943) 1952 SM4 Guarani SM4

enthusiasm for this type of flesh attributed to the Abipones by Dobrizhoffer.[43] The *coati* (Tupi word), a little animal related to the raccoon, is killed for food, and monkeys may also have been used. Alligators were probably eaten, although only certain portions such as the tail. Rengger gives us the impression that the aboriginal Cayuá lived at least half from hunting,[44] and this estimate may not be greatly excessive.

A number of birds were killed for food, and toucans, parrots, and parroqueets served both for food and feathers. Parroqueets and sometimes parrots were tamed for pets, and such birds are also today to be found walking about the roofs of some half a dozen houses at Taquapiri. The cetrich-like emu which runs in the open *campo* of the Cayuá region was probably eaten formerly, as it is today, but it is not known whether the eggs were also eaten. Small birds of this species were captured and kept about the settlement to be eaten or for their eggs (?), though it is a moot question whether this keeping of semi-domesticated emu antedates the introduction of the European practice of keeping chickens. Certain other birds were eaten such as the *tapera* (*gavião-tesoura*), but the flesh of others was restricted to the older people, those who had grandchildren; it would make a younger person lazy or cause other undesirable effects. The owl was one such bird.[45]

The bow and arrow was one of the most important weapons of the chase, being employed against most larger and faster game, but special, blunt arrows for birds were also made. Clubs appear to have been used in certain kinds of hunting as well as in war and in personal disputes; in hunting, clubs were used principally against smaller and slower animals. The pellet bow is said not to be aboriginal, but in any case, was early used against birds which perch within its range.

In the matter of fishing, the Cayuá do not seem to have made the use of this source of food that the coastal Tupi did. Métraux comments that "the Cainguá are the only Tupi-Guarani who are so poor in fishing methods; not only do they not possess nets, but they do not shoot fish with the bow and arrow like the majority of Indians of South America."[46] While our information may suffer from insufficient or faulty reporting, it seems likely that Métraux's general impression is correct—at least judging from the present. It would be less safe to say, however, that the Cayuá have always been so poor in fishing practices. At the time of the European entry the Cayuá are practically unreported and may have been better off than now in respect of fishing. In the second place, the retreat of the Cayuá to their present territory, as they sought to avoid contact with the Europeans, confined some of them to an area where fishing is often impracticable because of the lack of fish. Ambrosetti, for ex-

[43] Dobrizhoffer, 1822, pp. 253 ff. [44] Rengger, 1835, pp. 125–126.
[45] Ambrosetti, 1894, p. 107. [46] Métraux, 1928, p. 92.